

ON THE DENOMINATORS OF YOUNG'S SEMINORMAL BASIS

STEEN RYOM-HANSEN

ABSTRACT. We study the seminormal basis $\{f_t\}$ for the Specht modules of the Iwahori-Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_{q,n}$ of type A_{n-1} . We focus on the base change coefficients between the seminormal basis $\{f_t\}$ and Young's natural basis $\{e_t\}$ with emphasis on the denominators of these coefficients. In certain important cases we obtain simple formulas for these coefficients involving radial lengths. Even for general tableaux we obtain new formulas. On the way we prove a new result about submodules of the restricted Specht module at root of unity.

1. INTRODUCTION

This work is concerned with the representation theory of the Iwahori-Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_{q,n}$ of type A_{n-1} . It also provides results for the representation theory of the symmetric group S_n by specializing $q = 1$.

It is well known that the representation theory of $\mathcal{H}_{q,n}$ is parametrized by integer partitions λ of n . In fact, if q is a generic parameter, the generalization of the Specht modules for S_n to $\mathcal{H}_{q,n}$ gives modules S^λ that classify the irreducible modules in this case. Many results known for the Specht modules for S_n carry over to these new Specht modules. There are for example generalizations of Young's natural basis $\{e_t \mid t \text{ standard tableau}\}$ and the seminormal basis $\{f_t \mid t \text{ standard tableau}\}$ to S^λ . As for the symmetric group, the $\{e_t\}$ -basis has the advantage that it exists for all ground fields, whereas the $\{f_t\}$ -basis, which only exists generically, permits particularly simple action matrices. We also mention the generalization of the bilinear form to the Specht modules for $\mathcal{H}_{q,n}$, which generically is nondegenerate.

Our interest is the modular (non-semisimple) representation theory of $\mathcal{H}_{q,n}$, that is the case where q is a root of unity. According to an important Theorem of Ariki, see [A], the decomposition numbers for $\mathcal{H}_{q,n}$ at root of unity are determined by the Lascoux, Leclerc and Thibon algorithm, see [LLT].

In [RH] we showed that the coefficients of the quantum group action of the Fock space, a main ingredient of the LLT-algorithm, are related to the $\{f_t\}$ -basis. Indeed, let t_n be the λ -tableau that has n in a fixed removable node and the remaining numbers $\{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ filled in along rows.

¹Supported in part by FONDECYT grant 1090701.

This kind of tableaux already occur in the James-Murphy calculation of the Gram matrix of the Specht module, [JM], and we call them James-Murphy tableaux. Then we proved in [RH], using result from [JM], that the norm of f_{t_n} is closely related to the coefficients of the Fock space action.

This observation might indicate a connection between the modular representation theory of $\mathcal{H}_{q,n}$ and the $\{f_t\}$ -basis. Since the modular representation theory of $\mathcal{H}_{q,n}$ is related to the modular representation theory of S_n , one could hope for a connection to this as well.

A first idea might be that the connection goes via the denominators of the base change coefficients between the $\{f_t\}$ -basis and $\{e_t\}$ -basis and accordingly this work contains results that describe these base change coefficients. In the case of the James-Murphy tableaux t_n we find surprisingly simple formulas in our Lemma 2, Corollary 1 and Theorem 1. They are given in terms of certain operators $R_i \in \mathcal{H}_{q,n}$ that exist for any ground field. The denominators occur completely explicitly in our formulas as expressions of radial lengths between the n -node of t_n and the removable nodes below it. Note that the classical formulas for f_t , see e.g. (3) below, have intractable denominators.

In order to deal with the expansion of f_t for general tableau we first denote by $L_n \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathbb{C}(q),n}$ the element from Theorem 1 that satisfies $f_{t_n} = e_{t_n} L_n$. We then view t as a chain of partitions

$$\lambda^{\leq n} \supset \lambda^{\leq n-1} \supset \dots \supset \lambda^{\leq 1}$$

by removing successively $n, n-1, n-2, \dots$ from t and taking shapes. Next we construct for each i a James-Murphy $\lambda^{\leq i}$ -tableau t_i . We finally define $L_t := L_n L_{n-1} \dots L_1$. Our main Theorem 4 now states that $f_t = e_t L_t$.

To prove it we need to investigate modules of the form $f_t \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\zeta},r}$ where the Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\zeta},n}$ is defined over a local ring $\mathcal{A}_{\zeta}$. This is done in Theorem 2 and 3 where we show that such modules are actually Specht modules.

Before commenting on the proof techniques, we would like to point out another strong impetus to our work, the one coming from the theory of Macdonald polynomials. Indeed, the construction of the $\{f_t\}$ -basis has clear parallels to the construction of the Macdonald polynomials, say of type A . Both can be obtained through a Gram-Schmidt process over a partial order which must first be extended to a total order to perform the Gram-Schmidt process. In both cases the partial order is the dominance order on partitions. In the case of Macdonald polynomials the initial basis is the one of the monomial symmetric functions, in the case of the semi-normal basis the initial basis is the $\{e_t\}$ -basis. By Cherednik's work, the Macdonald polynomials are independent of this extension because they

are eigenvectors of operators coming from the double affine Hecke algebra; in the case of the seminormal basis this role is played by the Murphy operators, see Murphy's article [M3]. Finally, the norm formulas for the seminormal basis and for the Macdonald polynomials have strikingly similar structures, see [JM], [C].

On the other hand, in the above picture the analogue of the positivity theory for Macdonald polynomials in type A , due to M. Haiman and others, see for example [H], is so far missing. We view the results of the paper as a first attempt to fill in this gap.

Let us comment on the proofs of our results. The idea is very simple. The main ingredients are Young's seminormal form (5) on the action of a generator T_i on the $\{f_t\}$ -basis and the Garnir relations (2), both of which have appeared in numerous papers on type A representation theory. In our first Lemma 1 we give a formula for the repeated use of (5) corresponding to a row of a tableau. The formula has a certain similarity with the Garnir relations and it is this similarity that makes our proofs work. This is seen most clearly in our treatment of f_{t_n} for fat hook partitions $\lambda = (\lambda_1^{k_1}, \lambda_2^{k_2})$ in Lemma 2 of section 4. Section 5 deals with f_{t_n} for general partitions. In essence, it explains how to reduce to the case of fat hook partitions. The last section treats f_t for a general t . To treat this case we need a study of modules of the form $f_t \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_{\zeta,r}}$ that we think is of independent interest.

As already pointed out, the literature on the seminormal basis is vast. From our point of view it is worth mentioning Ram's article [R] that also has a treatment of the Garnir relations in relationship to the seminormal basis. It is based on certain operators τ_w for $w \in S_n$ that play a role similar to the classical E_t mentioned below in (3). Note that also τ_w have many denominators in general, but a key point of [R] is that τ_w is particularly simple if $w = w_0$ is the longest element. It would be interesting to investigate whether an understanding of other τ_w could lead to alternative derivation of our results, using the methods of [R]. Although such an alternative derivation is unlikely to be shorter than ours in the key case of a fat hook partition (close to one page from scratch) it may give a more conceptual proof of why this case generalizes nicely.

In the next section we set up notation, it may vary slightly from the one used in the introduction.

2. BASIC NOTATIONS AND RESULTS

Define $\mathcal{A} := \mathbb{C}[q, q^{-1}]$ and let $\mathcal{K}$ be the quotient field of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A},n}$ be the Iwahori-Hecke algebra of type A_n over $\mathcal{A}$. It is defined as the $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra

on generators $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{n-1}$ and relations

$$\begin{aligned} T_i T_j &= T_j T_i && \text{for } |i - j| > 1 \\ T_i T_j T_i &= T_j T_i T_j && \text{for } |i - j| = 1 \\ (T_i - q)(T_i + 1) &= 0 && \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1 \end{aligned}$$

For any $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra $\mathcal{B}$ we define the specialized Hecke algebra by $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{B},n} := \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A},n} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{B}$. In the case of $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{K}$ we also write $\mathcal{H}_n := \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{K},n}$. Let S_n be the symmetric group on n letters. It is a Coxeter group with basic generators $s_i = (i, i+1)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. Assume that $w \in S_n$ has reduced expression $w = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_N}$. Then $T_w := T_{i_1} T_{i_2} \dots T_{i_N}$ is independent of the reduced expression and the set $\{T_w \mid w \in S_n\}$ is an $\mathcal{A}$ -basis for $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A},n}$.

Let n be a positive integer and denote by Par_n the set of integer partitions of n and by Comp_n the set of compositions of n . An element λ of Par_n is a weakly decreasing sequence of integers $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ such that $\lambda_i \geq 0$ for all i , $\lambda_i = 0$ for i sufficiently big and $\sum_i \lambda_i = n$. An element of Comp_n is defined the same way, but without the condition on weakly decreasing. If $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ is a partition or composition we shall mostly write it as a finite sequence, leaving out the zeros. The dominance order $\leq$ on Par_n or Comp_n is given by $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots) \leq \mu = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots)$ if $\sum_{i=1}^j \lambda_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^j \mu_i$ for all j . The dominance order is only a partial order but can be embedded into a total order in various ways, for example by $\lambda \prec \mu$ if there is j such that $\sum_{i=1}^j \lambda_i < \sum_{i=1}^j \mu_i$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{j'} \lambda_i = \sum_{i=1}^{j'} \mu_i$ for all $j' < j$.

Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots)$ and suppose that $\lambda \in \text{Par}_n$ or $\lambda \in \text{Comp}_n$. The Young diagram $\mathcal{Y}(\lambda)$ for λ is the graphical representation of λ through λ_1 boxes, or nodes, in the first row, λ_2 boxes in the second row, placed below and left-aligned with respect to the first row and so on. We use the coordinates (r, c) to refer to the node of $\mathcal{Y}(\lambda)$ in the r 'th row from the top and in the c 'th column from the left. A λ -tableau t is a filling of the nodes of $\mathcal{Y}(\lambda)$ with the numbers $1, 2, \dots, n$. The number in position (r, c) of t is referred to as $t[r, c]$. We call t row standard if the numbers of each row appear increasingly from left to right, and call t column standard if the numbers of each column appear increasingly from top to bottom. If t is both row and column standard, we call it standard. We let $t \mapsto [t]$ be the function that maps t to its underlying partition, thus $[t] = \lambda$ if and only if t is a λ -partition.

Let t be a λ -tableau and let $t|_{1,2,\dots,k}$ denote the tableaux obtained by deleting the nodes containing the numbers $k+1, k+2, \dots, n$. With this notation the dominance order can be extended to λ -tableaux by the rule $s \leq t$ if $s|_{1,2,\dots,k} \leq t|_{1,2,\dots,k}$ for all k . The total order $\prec$ can be extended to a total order on tableaux by the rule $s \prec t$ if there is k such that $s|_{1,2,\dots,k} \prec t|_{1,2,\dots,k}$ and $s|_{1,2,\dots,k'} = t|_{1,2,\dots,k'}$ for all $k' > k$. The largest

λ -tableau with respect to both orders is denoted t^λ and has the numbers $1, 2, \dots, n$ filled in increasingly along the rows. The lowest λ -tableau t_λ has the numbers $1, 2, \dots, n$ filled in increasing along the columns.

Let the composition of cycles in S_n be from the left to the right. Then S_n acts on the right on the set of λ -tableau by permuting the entries. For t a λ -tableau, we define $d(t) \in S_n$ by the rule $t = t^\lambda d(t)$. We let $S_\lambda \subset S_n$ denote the row stabilizer of t^λ under the action and define for any λ -tableau s, t :

$$x_\lambda := \sum_{w \in S_\lambda} T_w, \quad x_{st} := T_{d(s)^{-1}} x_\lambda T_{d(t)}$$

It is proved in [M1] that the set $\{x_{st} \mid \lambda \in \text{Par}_n, s, t \text{ standard } \lambda\text{-tableaux}\}$ is a basis for $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A},n}$, the so-called standard basis. Let $\overline{N}_\lambda$ be the $\mathcal{A}$ -span of $\{x_{st} \mid s, t \text{ are } \mu\text{-tableaux with } \mu > \lambda\}$. Then $\overline{N}_\lambda$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{H}_n$ and the Specht module $S_\mathcal{A}^\lambda$ is the $\mathcal{H}_n$ -right module generated by $x_\lambda + \overline{N}_\lambda$. It is free over $\mathcal{A}$ and has basis given by $e_t := x_{\lambda t} + \overline{N}_\lambda$ where t runs over standard λ -tableau. We shall refer to this basis as the standard basis for $S_\mathcal{A}^\lambda$, and shall refer to e_t as (non)standard if t is (non)standard. For $\mathcal{B}$ an $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra we let $S_\mathcal{B}^\lambda$ denote the specialized Specht module and write $S^\lambda := S_\mathcal{K}^\lambda$ if $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{K}$.

For any $\mathcal{B}$ as above, there is a symmetric bilinear form on $S_\mathcal{B}^\lambda$ with values in $\mathcal{B}$, given by $\langle e_s, e_t \rangle_\lambda = a$ where a is the coefficient of x_λ in $x_\lambda T_{d(s)} T_{d(t)^{-1}} x_\lambda$ when expanded in the standard basis. If $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{K}$ the form is nondegenerate, but if $\mathcal{B} = k$ is another field the form may be singular. The radical $\text{rad}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\lambda$ is a submodule of S_k^λ for any k and the quotient $S_k^\lambda / \text{rad}\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\lambda$ is either simple or zero. The nonzero modules that arise this way provide a classification of the simple modules for $\mathcal{H}_{k,n}$.

Assume that s, t are λ -tableaux and let $\tau := ts_i$. Suppose that $t[r, c] = i$ and that $t[r_1, c_1] = i + 1$. The action of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A},n}$ on x_{st} is then given by the formulas

$$x_{st} T_i := \begin{cases} x_{s\tau} & \text{if } r < r_1 \\ qx_{st} & \text{if } r = r_1 \\ qx_{s\tau} + (q - 1)x_{st} & \text{if } r > r_1 \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

with analogous expressions for the multiplication on the left. From these formulas we obtain similar formulas for the action on $e_t \in S_\mathcal{A}^\lambda$. Unfortunately, the result of applying these to a standard e_t will not always give a linear combination of standard e_t and so we need straightening rules to express nonstandard e_t in terms of standard ones.

The relevant straightening rules are the q -analogues of the Garnir relations, known from the representation theory of S_n . These q -analogues are awkward to write down explicitly for general tableaux, but we shall only

along the dominance order $<$ as follows:

$$f_t := e_t - \sum_{t < s} \frac{\langle f_s, e_t \rangle_\lambda}{\langle f_s, f_s \rangle_\lambda} f_s$$

This kind of Gram-Schmidt algorithm will in general not lead to an orthogonal basis, because $<$ is only a partial order and so $\langle f_s, f_t \rangle_\lambda$ may be nonzero if s and t are not related. But since the L_m are selfadjoint with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the $r_t(m)$ separate tableaux over K , we get from (4) that the f_t are orthogonal in this case. We could then also have used $\prec$, or actually any refinement of $<$ to a total order on standard λ -tableaux, in the Gram-Schmidt process.

This formalism has a striking analogue in the theory of symmetric functions. A natural basis of the space of symmetric functions Sym is given by the monomial symmetric functions $\{m_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \text{Par}\}$. The Macdonald polynomials P_λ are constructed by a weak Gram-Schmidt algorithm on $\{m_\lambda\}$ similar to the above, using the Macdonald inner product on Sym and the dominance order on Par . But they can also be realized as eigenvectors for certain selfadjoint operators on Sym that have their origin in the Cherednik algebra, and so the weak Gram-Schmidt algorithm indeed gives an orthogonal basis.

One of the virtues of the seminormal basis over the standard basis is the nice form that the matrix of T_i takes. Indeed, it can be written down directly without straightening with the Garnir relations, because of the following formula which can be deduced from (3) and (4). It is a q -analogue of Young's seminormal form. It can be found for example in [Ma].

Define first the radial distance from the node (a, b) to the node (a', b') of λ by $b' - b - (a' - a)$. Fix a standard λ -tableau t and write ρ for the radial distance from the node occupied by i to the node occupied by $i - 1$ in t , in other words $\rho = r_t(i - 1) - r_t(i)$. Setting $s := t(i, i + 1)$ we have

$$f_t T_i = \begin{cases} f_t & \text{if } s \text{ is not standard} \\ -\frac{1}{[\rho]_q} f_t + f_s & \text{if } s \text{ is standard and } s < t \\ \frac{q^\rho}{[\rho]_q} f_t + \frac{q[\rho+1]_q [\rho+1]_q}{[\rho]_q^2} f_s & \text{if } s \text{ is standard and } s > t \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

3. ON YOUNG'S SEMINORMAL FORM

As already mentioned in the introduction, our main goal is to find a formula for the base change matrix from the f_t basis to the e_t basis, i.e. to write f_t as a linear K -combination of e_t with t running over standard tableaux.

Note first that Young's seminormal form (5) gives rise to the following algorithm for writing f_t as a linear combination of e_t with t running over *all* tableaux: Write first $d(t) = s_{i_1}s_{i_2}\dots s_{i_k}$ in reduced form and set then

$$t_0 := t^\lambda, t_1 := t_0 s_{i_1}, t_2 := t_1 s_{i_2}, \dots, t_k := t_{k-1} s_{i_k}$$

so that $t = t_k$. Applying T_{i_1} on both sides of $f_\lambda = e_\lambda$, i.e. $f_{t_0} = e_{t_0}$, and using Young's seminormal form (5) on the LHS and (1) on the RHS gives that

$$f_{t_0} - \rho_1 f_{t_1} = e_{t_1} \Leftrightarrow f_{t_1} = \frac{1}{\rho_1}(e_{t_1} + f_{t_0}) = \frac{1}{\rho_1}(e_{t_1} + e_{t_0})$$

We next apply T_{i_2} to both sides of the equation $f_{t_1} = \frac{1}{\rho_1}(e_{t_1} + e_{t_0})$ and get from (5) and (1) that

$$f_{t_2} + \rho'_1 f_{t_1} = \sum_s \mu'_s e_s$$

for explicitly given $\rho'_1, \mu'_s \in K$ and hence $f_{t_2} = \sum_s \mu_s e_s$ for certain $\mu_s \in K$. This procedure is repeated until arriving at f_t .

We shall call the above algorithm for calculating f_t *repeated use of Young's seminormal form*. Executing a few steps of this algorithm, one notices quickly that the coefficients μ_s of the resulting expansion $f_t = \sum_s \mu_s e_s$ tend to be complicated expressions in the radial lengths of the t_i , especially if $d(t)$ is big. Moreover, since the action formula (1) in general does not produce standard tableaux, even when $q = 1$, the repeated use of Young's seminormal form will in general *not* give an expression of f_t in terms of standard e_s .

Our goal is to remedy these deficiencies, that is to apply the Garnir relations to all nonstandard e_s in the above expansion $f_t = \sum_s \mu_s e_s$, and at the same time obtain a simple formula. At a first glance, there is no reason to expect this to be possible, especially when one takes into account that in general repeated use of the Garnir relations is needed to straighten a nonstandard e_t . The reason why we are still able to obtain a nice formula lies hidden in a certain compatibility between Young's seminormal form (5) and the Garnir relations (2) that we shall make precise in the Lemma at the end of this section.

For $i \leq j$ we first find it useful to introduce $\sigma_{i,j} \in S_n$ as follows

$$\sigma_{i,j} := (i, i+1)(i+1, i+2) \dots (j-1, j)$$

with the convention $\sigma_{i,i} := 1$ and extend this to the Hecke algebra by $T_{i,j} := T_{\sigma_{i,j}}$. We shall use this notation throughout the paper.

Let us now fix $\lambda \in \text{Par}_n$ and an a such that $1 \leq a \leq n$ and such that the a -node of t^λ , that is the node of t^λ filled in with a , is removable, i.e. removing it from $\mathcal{Y}(\lambda)$ still gives the Young diagram of a partition. Take b with $a \leq b \leq n$ and assume that the node of b in t^λ belongs to the right

border of $\mathcal{Y}(\lambda)$, i.e. b and $b+1$ lie in different rows of t^λ or $b = n$. Set $t_b := t^\lambda \sigma_{a,b}$. To illustrate, suppose that $\lambda = (6, 4, 4, 2) \in \text{Par}_{16}$ and that $a = 6$. Then t_{10} and t_{14} are as follows

$$t_{10} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 10 \\ \hline 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & & \\ \hline 11 & 12 & 13 & 14 & & \\ \hline 15 & 16 & & & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad t_{14} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 14 \\ \hline 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & & \\ \hline 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 & & \\ \hline 15 & 16 & & & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Assume that the i 'th row of t_b are $\{b+1, b+2, \dots, \beta\}$ where $b \leq \beta$, that is $\lambda_i = \beta - b$. For example, in the above case t_{10} , we have $i = 3$ and the numbers of the third row are $\{11, 12, 13, 14\}$. We can now state the Lemma we have in mind:

Lemma 1. *Let r be the radial distance from the node of t_b containing β to the node of t_b containing b . Then we have*

$$f_{t_\beta} = f_{t_b} \left(T_{b,\beta} + \frac{1}{[r]_q} (T_{b,\beta-1} + T_{b,\beta-2} + \dots + T_{b,b+1} + 1) \right)$$

Proof. The radial distance in t_b from the $b+1$ -node to the node b -node is $c = r + \lambda_i - 1$ and so we get by Young's seminormal form

$$f_{t_b} T_a = f_{t_{b+1}} - \frac{1}{[c]_q} f_{t_b} \Leftrightarrow f_{t_{b+1}} = f_{t_b} \left(T_b + \frac{1}{[c]_q} \right)$$

The radial distance in $t_{t_{b+1}}$ from the $b+2$ -node to the $b+1$ -node is $c-1$ and so we get

$$f_{t_{b+1}} T_{b+1} = f_{t_{b+2}} - \frac{1}{[c-1]_q} f_{t_{b+1}} \Leftrightarrow f_{t_{b+2}} = f_{t_{b+1}} T_{b+1} + \frac{1}{[c-1]_q} f_{t_{b+1}}$$

We combine this with the expression found for $f_{t_{b+1}}$ and get

$$\begin{aligned} f_{t_{b+2}} &= f_{t_b} \left(T_b + \frac{1}{[c]_q} \right) T_{b+1} + f_{t_b} \left(T_b + \frac{1}{[c]_q} \right) \frac{1}{[c-1]_q} = \\ &= f_{t_b} \left(T_{b,b+2} + \frac{q}{[c]_q} + \frac{1}{[c-1]_q} T_b + \frac{1}{[c]_q} \frac{1}{[c-1]_q} \right) = \\ &= f_{t_b} \left(T_{b,b+2} + \frac{1}{[c-1]_q} T_b + \frac{1}{[c-1]_q} \right) = f_{t_b} \left(T_{b,b+2} + \frac{1}{[c-1]_q} (T_b + 1) \right) \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $q[c-1]_q + 1 = [c]_q$ and that $f_{t_b} T_{b+1} = f_{t_b}$, which is the first case of Young's seminormal form. We now repeat this calculation until we arrive at the formula of the Lemma. $\square$

Note that $r = 1$ is not allowed in the Lemma since t_b would be a Garnir tableau and so nonstandard. But note also that the sum of Hecke algebra elements in this 'limit case' is exactly the same as the sum of Hecke algebra elements of the corresponding Garnir relation. This compatibility lies at the heart of the results to follow. At a much higher level, it could possibly have been deduced from the results of [R] as well.

4. FAT HOOK PARTITIONS

We assume in this section that λ is fat hook partition, i.e. of the form

$$\lambda = (\lambda_1^{k_1}, \lambda_2^{k_2}) := (\overbrace{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1}^{k_1}, \overbrace{\lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_2}^{k_2})$$

Then $\lambda \in \text{Par}_n$ with $n = k_1\lambda_1 + k_2\lambda_2$ and λ has two removable nodes. We focus on the rightmost of these, given by the coordinates (k_1, λ_1) and set $a := t^\lambda[k_1, \lambda_1]$. For $b \geq a$ we define $t_b := t^\lambda \sigma_{a,b}$ and write $e_b := e_{t_b^\lambda}$ and $f_b := f_{t_b^\lambda}$, to simplify notation. This notation is closely related to the one of the previous section, with the difference that a is this time given by λ .

To illustrate we use the partition $\lambda = (6^2, 4^3)$. It is a fat hook partition with $a = 12$ and we have for example

$$t_{15} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 15 \\ \hline 12 & 13 & 14 & 16 & & \\ \hline 17 & 18 & 19 & 20 & & \\ \hline 21 & 22 & 23 & 24 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad t_{24} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ \hline 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 24 \\ \hline 12 & 13 & 14 & 15 & & \\ \hline 16 & 17 & 18 & 19 & & \\ \hline 20 & 21 & 22 & 23 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

We associate to the i 'th row of t^λ an element $R_i \in \mathcal{H}_d$ in the following way. Let a_i (resp. b_i) denote the last element of the $i-1$ 'th row (resp. i 'th) of t^λ . Thus, for $i > k_1$ the i 'th row of t^λ contains the elements $a_i + 1, a_i + 2, \dots, a_i + \lambda_2$ and $b_i = a_i + \lambda_2$. Define now $R_i \in \mathcal{H}_n$ as follows

$$R_i := 1 + T_{a_i, a_i+1} + \dots + T_{a_i, b_i-2} + T_{a_i, b_i-1} \quad (6)$$

Set $F_{k_1+1} := e_\lambda R_{k_1+1}$ and recursively for $i = k_1 + 2, \dots, k_1 + k_2$

$$F_i := (e_{a_i} - qF_{i-1})R_i \quad (7)$$

Let r be the radial distance in t_n from the $n-1$ -node to the n -node. Our first result is now the following surprisingly simple formula for the seminormal basis vector f_n . Let us remark that repeated use of Young's seminormal form to calculate f_n , even via the previous Lemma 1, apparently would lead to a complicated expression involving several denominators of radial lengths between the (k_1, λ_1) -node and the nodes below it. But according to our formula, these denominators reduce to only one denominator after straightening with the Garnir relations. In the above example with $r = 6$, we get for instance that $[6]_q f_{22} \in S_{\mathcal{A}}^\lambda$.

Lemma 2. *We have $f_n := e_n + \frac{1}{[r]_q} F_{k_1+k_2}$. The expansion of $F_{k_1+k_2}$ gives a linear combination of standard e_t .*

Proof. To simplify notation we set $n_i := a_{i+k_1}$ and $m_i := b_{i+k_1}$ let $r_i := \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + i$. We then prove by induction on k that

$$f_{m_k} = e_{m_k} + \frac{1}{[r_k]_q} F_{k_1+k} \quad (8)$$

The case $k = k_2$ is the formula of the Theorem, since $n = m_{k_2}$ and $r = r_{k_2}$. The induction basis $k = 1$ follows from Lemma 1 and the definitions. Let us prove the induction step, that is we assume (8) is true for $k - 1$ and prove it for k . Thus we have that $f_{m_{k-1}} = e_{m_{k-1}} + \frac{1}{[r_k-1]_q} F_{k_1+k-1}$ and get from Lemma 1 that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{m_k} &= (e_{m_{k-1}} + \frac{1}{[r_k-1]_q} F_{k_1+k-1}) T_{m_{k-1}, m_k} + \frac{1}{[r_k]_q} (e_{m_{k-1}} + \frac{1}{[r_k-1]_q} F_{k_1+k-1}) R_{k_1+k} \\ &= e_{m_k} + \frac{1}{[r_k]_q} e_{m_{k-1}} R_{k_1+k} + \frac{1}{[r_k-1]_q} (F_{k_1+k-1} T_{m_{k-1}, m_k} + \frac{1}{[r_k]_q} F_{k_1+k-1} R_{k_1+k}) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Let us assume that e_t occurs in the expansion of F_{k_1+k-1} in terms of standard e_t . From the definition of F_{k_1+k-1} and from the fact that straightening an e_s with the Garnir relations produces a linear combination of e_t with $s \leq t$, it then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} t[k_1 + k - 1, \lambda_2] &= n_k \\ t[k_1 + k, j] &= n_k + j \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, \lambda_2 \end{aligned}$$

In other words, t looks like t^λ in these positions. From this we get that

$$e_t R_{k_1+k} = e_t + e_t \sigma_k^1 + e_t \sigma_k^2 + \dots + e_t \sigma_k^{\lambda_2-1} \quad (10)$$

where we for simplicity write $\sigma_k^i := \sigma_{n_k, n_k+i}$. These terms are all standard.

We now focus on $e_t T_{m_{k-1}, m_k} = e_t T_{n_k, m_k}$ with the same t as above. Since $T_{n_k, m_k} = T_{n_k} T_{n_k+1} \dots T_{m_k-2} T_{m_k-1}$ we get arguing as before that

$$e_t T_{n_k, m_k} = e_t \sigma_{n_k, m_k} \quad (11)$$

Note that $t \sigma_{n_k, m_k}$ is nonstandard. On the other hand, multiplying the Garnir relation (2) for the tableau g_{k_1+k, λ_2} by $T_{d(t)}$ gives the relation $e_t \sigma_{n_k, m_k} + \sum_{i=0}^{\lambda_2-1} e_t \sigma_k^i = 0$. We insert it into (11) and find

$$e_t T_{n_k, m_k} = -(e_t + e_t \sigma_k^1 + e_t \sigma_k^2 + \dots + e_t \sigma_k^{\lambda_2-1}) \quad (12)$$

with all terms standard.

Combining (9), (10) and (12) we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} f_{m_k} &= e_{m_k} + \frac{1}{[r_k]_q} e_{m_{k-1}} R_{k_1+k} - \frac{q}{[r_k]_q} F_{k_1+k-1} R_{k_1+k} = \\ &= e_{m_k} + \frac{1}{[r_k]_q} (e_{m_{k-1}} - q F_{k_1+k-1}) R_{k_1+k} = e_{m_k} + \frac{1}{[r_k]_q} F_{k_1+k} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

which proves the Lemma. $\square$

Let us illustrate the formula on the partition $\lambda = (3, 2^2)$ of 7. In that case we have $r = 3$ and the formula for f_7 becomes

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 7 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline 5 & 6 & \\ \hline \end{array} + \frac{1}{[3]_q} \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline 6 & 7 & \\ \hline \end{array} - q \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & 5 & \\ \hline 6 & 7 & \\ \hline \end{array} - q \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & 5 & \\ \hline 6 & 7 & \\ \hline \end{array} + \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 6 \\ \hline 3 & 4 & \\ \hline 5 & 7 & \\ \hline \end{array} - q \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & 6 & \\ \hline 5 & 7 & \\ \hline \end{array} - q \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & 6 & \\ \hline 5 & 7 & \\ \hline \end{array} \right)$$

where we identify t and e_t .

Remark 1. *Calculating a few examples one sees that the expansion of e_t in f_t does not permit the same simple description as that of the Lemma.*

We give the following useful reformulation of the Lemma.

Corollary 1. *Suppose that $\lambda = (\lambda_1^{k_1}, \lambda_2^{k_2})$ is a fat hook partition and suppose that r, n, f_n, e_n, b_i are as above. Define $F'_{k_1+k_2}$ by*

$$F'_{k_1+k_2} = (e_{b_{k_1+k_2-1}} R_{k_1+k_2}) - q(e_{b_{k_1+k_2-2}} R_{k_1+k_2-1} R_{k_1+k_2}) + \dots + (-q)^{k_2-2} (e_{b_{k_1+2}} R_{k_1+2} \dots R_{k_1+k_2}) + (-q)^{k_2-1} (e_{b_{k_1}} R_{k_1+1} R_{k_1+2} \dots R_{k_1+k_2})$$

Then we have $f_n = e_n + \frac{1}{[r]} F'_{k_1+k_2}$.

Proof. This is nothing but the expansion of the recursion given by the previous Lemma 1. Indeed we have from it that

$$F_{k_1+k_2} = (e_{b_{k_1+k_2}} - q(\dots (e_{b_{k_1+2}} - q(e_{b_{k_1+1}} - q e_{b_{k_1}} R_{k_1+1}) R_{k_1+2}) \dots) R_{k_1+k_2})$$

Multiplying out we get the formula of the Corollary, that is $F'_{k_1+k_2} = F_{k_1+k_2}$. $\square$

5. EXPANSION OF f_n FOR GENERAL PARTITIONS

Our next aim is to extend the result of the previous section to arbitrary partitions. We shall see that also in this more general case there is a simple formula for f_n that permits a good control of the denominators of the expansion coefficients.

Let us set up the relevant notation. Let λ be a partition of n . We fix a removable node $(k, l) = (k_0, l_0)$ of λ and let the removable nodes below it be $(k_j, l_j), j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ taken from top to bottom, that is such that $k_{j+1} > k_j$ for $j = 0, \dots, N-1$. We define $c_j := t^\lambda[k_j, l_j]$, and especially define $c := c_0$ as the content of the (k, l) 'th node of t^λ and we still let a_i (resp. b_i) denote the last element of the $i-1$ 'th (resp. i 'th) row of t^λ . We set $t_d := t^\lambda \sigma_{c,d}$ and write $e_d := e_{t_d}$ and $f_d := f_{t_d}^\lambda$. Our aim is now to determine the expansion of f_n in terms of standard e_t .

The element $R_i \in \mathcal{H}_n$ of (6) was a key ingredient of the recursive definition of $F_i \in S^\lambda$ in (7). We use a similar recursion to define elements $\mathcal{F}_j \in \mathcal{H}_n$ for $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1$ as follows. First we define

$$\tilde{\sigma}_j := \sigma_{c_j, c_{j+1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\sigma}_j^i := \sigma_{c_j, c_j + i l_{j+1}}$$

and note that $\tilde{\sigma}_j^{k_{j+1}-k_j} = \tilde{\sigma}_j$. Next we set $\varphi_j^1 := R_{k_{j+1}}$ and recursively for $i = 2, 3, \dots, k_{j+1} - k_j$

$$\varphi_j^i := (T_{\tilde{\sigma}_j^i} - q \varphi_j^{i-1}) R_{k_j+i}$$

Finally $\mathcal{F}_j$, our generalization of F_j from the previous section, is defined as follows

$$\mathcal{F}_j := \varphi_j^{k_{j+1}-k_j} \tag{14}$$

Let r_j be the radial distance in λ from the (k_j, l_j) -node to the (k, l) -node and define $\tilde{f}_j \in S^\lambda$ by setting $\tilde{f}_0 := e_\lambda$ and recursively

$$\tilde{f}_{j+1} = \tilde{f}_j (T_{\tilde{\sigma}_j} + \frac{1}{[r_{j+1}]} \mathcal{F}_j) \quad (15)$$

Our aim is now to prove that $\tilde{f}_N = f_n$. Apart from the information deduced from this on the denominators of the expansion coefficients between the seminormal basis and the standard basis, we shall see at the end of the paper that actually the definition of $\tilde{f}_N$ given above provides an algorithm for calculating f_n with a much lower complexity than repeated use of Young's seminormal form.

The proof that $\tilde{f}_N = f_n$ is based on the same simple compatibility between the Garnir relations and Young's seminormal form that was used in the proof of Lemma 2. A main point is that the cancellations that took place in the proof of Lemma 2 can be carried out in an abstract setting where r is no longer the actual radial length, but rather a kind of variable. We first need to state a couple of auxiliary Lemmas.

Note first that Lemma 1 gives rises to elements $p_j \in \mathcal{H}_n$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, N-1$ such that $f_{c_j} p_j = f_{c_{j+1}}$. They satisfy

Lemma 3. *We have $e_{c_j} p_j = e_{c_{j+1}} + \frac{1}{[r_{j+1}]_q} e_{c_j} \mathcal{F}_j$.*

Proof. The proof mimics the proof of Theorem 2. Note that the proof of that Theorem only uses the realization of f_n through $f_n = e_\lambda p_0$, with p_0 referring to the fat hook partition λ and so the cancellations of Theorem 2 will also occur in this new setting. $\square$

We need one more auxiliary result along the same lines. For each row index i and integer x we define $D_i^x \in \mathcal{H}_n$ as follows

$$D_i^x := T_{\sigma_{c_i, c_{i+1}}} + \frac{1}{[x + r_i]_q} R_i$$

and then $p_j^x \in \mathcal{H}_n$ as

$$p_j^x := D_{k_j+1}^x D_{k_j+2}^{x+1} \cdots D_{k_{j+1}-1}^{x+k_{j+1}-k_j-1} D_{k_{j+1}}^{x+k_{j+1}-k_j}$$

This definition is related to Lemma 1, and as a matter of fact we have $p_j^0 = p_j$. We introduce $f_{c_{j+1}}^x \in S^\lambda$ through

$$f_{c_{j+1}}^x := e_{c_j} p_j^x$$

It may be considered a generalization of the seminormal basis, since $f_n = f_n^0$ in the case of a fat hook partition.

Slightly more generally we consider a λ -tableau t that coincides with t_{c_j} in the node (k_j, l_j) and in the rows $k_j+1, k_j+2, \dots$ and define $f_{c_{j+1}}^{x,t} := e_t p_j^x$. The result that we need is now the following.

Lemma 4. *In the above setup we have*

$$\begin{aligned} a) \quad f_{c_{j+1}}^x &= e_{c_{j+1}} + \frac{1}{[r_{j+1}+x]_q} e_{c_j} \mathcal{F}_j \\ b) \quad f_{c_{j+1}}^{x,t} &= e_t T_{\sigma_{c_j, c_{j+1}}} + \frac{1}{[r_{j+1}+x]_q} e_t \mathcal{F}_j \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Once again the proof mimics the proof of Theorem 2. That proof depended on the formula of Lemma 1. In the actual situation the radial length r has been replaced by $x + r_{j+1}$, but for the cancellations to work, the meaning of r is irrelevant. $\square$

We are finally in position to prove the promised generalization of Theorem 2 to arbitrary partitions. Once again, the interesting part are the denominators r_j . It follows for example that $[r_1]_q \dots [r_N]_q f_n \in S_{\mathcal{A}}(\lambda)$

Theorem 1. *The element $\tilde{f}_N$ calculated by the recursion (15) coincides with f_n of the seminormal basis. The e_t 's arising from the expansion of the recursion are all standard.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on N , with the case $N = 1$ corresponding to Theorem 2. The first term of $f_{c_1} = e_{c_1} + \frac{1}{[r_1]_q} e_{\lambda} \mathcal{F}_0$ has c_1 in position (k_0, l_0) whereas all terms involved in $e_{\lambda} \mathcal{F}_0$ have c_1 in position (k_1, l_1) . Letting $p_j \in \mathcal{H}_n$ be as in Lemma 3 we now have that $f_{c_2} = f_{c_1} p_1$ and so $f_{c_2} = e_{c_1} p_1 + \frac{1}{[r_1]_q} e_{c_0} \mathcal{F}_0 p_1$, since $e_{\lambda} = e_{c_0}$. On the other hand, by Lemma 3 we have $e_{c_1} p_1 = e_{c_2} + \frac{1}{[r_2]_q} e_{c_1} \mathcal{F}_1 = e_{c_1} T_{c_1, c_2} + \frac{1}{[r_2]_q} e_{c_1} \mathcal{F}_1$ and hence we only need to prove that the same formula holds for all e_t involved in $e_{c_0} \mathcal{F}_1$, i.e. that

$$e_t p_1 = e_t T_{c_1, c_2} + \frac{1}{[r_2]_q} e_t \mathcal{F}_1$$

holds. For each of these e_t -terms, the (k_1, l_1) 'th node has content c_1 . We now apply part b) of Lemma 4 with $x = r_2 - r_1$. The general induction step is treated the same way. $\square$

Remark 2. *For later use, we multiply the $\mathcal{F}_j$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_j$ of the above recursion (15) to form the element $\mathcal{P}_{t_n} = \mathcal{P}_n \in \mathcal{H}_n$. By the Theorem is satisfies $f_n = e_n \mathcal{P}_n$.*

We illustrate the Theorem on the partition $\lambda = (4, 3, 2^2)$. We set $(k_0, l_0) := (k, l) := (1, 4)$ and then have

$$t^{\lambda} = t_4 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 5 & 6 & 7 & \\ \hline 8 & 9 & & \\ \hline 10 & 11 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad t_7 = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 7 \\ \hline 4 & 5 & 6 & \\ \hline 8 & 9 & & \\ \hline 10 & 11 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad t_{11} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 & 11 \\ \hline 4 & 5 & 6 & \\ \hline 7 & 8 & & \\ \hline 9 & 10 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

Then $(k_1, l_1) = (2, 3)$, $(k_2, l_2) = (4, 2)$ whereas $c = c_0 = 4$, $c_1 = 7$, $c_3 = 11$ and $r_1 = 2$, $r_2 = 5$. From this we get

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 &= 1 + T_{4,6} + T_{4,5}, \quad R_3 = 1 + T_{7,8}, \quad R_4 = 1 + T_{9,10} \\ \mathcal{F}_0 &= R_2, \quad \mathcal{F}_1 = (T_{7,9} - q R_3) R_4 \end{aligned}$$

and finally

$$f_{11} = e_\lambda (T_{4,7} + \frac{1}{[2]_q} \mathcal{F}_0) (T_{7,11} + \frac{1}{[5]_q} \mathcal{F}_1)$$

Multiplying this expression out gives a linear combination of standard e_t .

6. THE RESTRICTED SPECHT MODULE

In this section we give an application of the methods of the previous section to the modular representation theory of $\mathcal{H}_n$. We finally use it to attack the problem of expanding a general f_t in terms of the e_t basis.

We denote by res the restriction functor from $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A},n}$ -modules to $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A},n-1}$ -modules. By the branching rule, the restricted Specht module $\text{res } S_{\mathcal{A}}^\lambda$ has a filtration with quotients consisting of Specht modules. The filtration can be constructed combinatorially as follows. Suppose that the positions of the removable nodes of λ are (k_i, l_i) , $i = 1, \dots, M$ where $k_{i+1} > k_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$. Define

$$E_j := \text{span}_{\mathcal{A}} \{ e_t \mid t \text{ standard, } n \text{ is in one of the rows } k_j, k_{j+1}, \dots, k_M \text{ of } t \}$$

By the results of [M4] we then have that $0 \subset E_M \subset E_{M-1} \subset \dots \subset E_1 = \text{res } S_{\mathcal{A}}^\lambda$ is a $\mathcal{H}_{n-1}$ -filtration of $\text{res } S_{\mathcal{A}}^\lambda$ such that for all j

$$E_j / E_{j+1} \cong S_{\mathcal{A}}^{\mu_j} \text{ where } \mu_j := \lambda \setminus (k_j, l_j)$$

The proof of this result hinges on the Garnir relations (2). Since E_j and S^{μ_j} are free $\mathcal{A}$ -modules, we obtain a similar filtration for the specialized module $\text{res } S_k^\lambda$. In particular, we get from this that $\text{res } S_k^\lambda$ always has $S_k^{\mu_M}$ as a submodule, whereas $S_k^{\mu_i}$ always appears as a subquotient of $\text{res } S_k^\lambda$.

We shall now use the seminormal basis to show that under certain circumstances, $S_k^{\mu_i}$ actually appears as a submodule of $\text{res } S_k^\lambda$ and not just as a subquotient. We need this result, or rather a variation of it that we shall present shortly, to complete our treatment of the expansion coefficients between the f_t and the e_t -basis. Apart from this we also believe that it is of independent interest, being an application of Young's seminormal form to the modular representation theory of the Hecke algebra.

Let us set up the relevant notation. Assume that $k = \mathbb{C}$ is the complex field and that $\zeta \in k \setminus \{0\}$. Set $e := \min\{n \mid n \geq 0, \zeta^n = 1\}$ with the convention that $\min \emptyset = \infty$. Fix $(k, l) := (k_j, l_j)$ for some $j = 1, 2, \dots, M$ and let r_i be the radial distance from the (k_i, l_i) 'th to the (k, l) 'th node of λ . Set $t_n := t^\lambda \sigma_{c,n}$ where $c := t^\lambda[k, l]$ and let t^μ be the largest $\mu = \mu^j$ -tableau. Set $f_n := f_{t_n}$ and $e_n := e_{t_n}$. Let $\mathcal{A}_\zeta := \{ \frac{a}{b} \mid a, b \in \mathcal{A}, b(\zeta) \neq 0 \}$. Then $\mathcal{A}_\zeta$ is a local ring with maximal ideal $I := (x - \zeta)\mathcal{A}_\zeta$ and residue field $\mathcal{A}_\zeta / I = \mathbb{C}$. Let $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta, n}$ be the Hecke algebra defined over $\mathcal{A}_\zeta$ and define $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu := f_n \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta, n}$. We can then formulate the Theorem that was alluded to. Note that the Nakayama Conjecture for Hecke algebras, see e.g. [DJ], would also have proved the existence of a submodule as in part c).

Theorem 2. Assume that $[r_i]_\zeta \neq 0$ for $i = j + 1, j + 2, \dots, M$. Then

- a) $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$ is a $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta, n-1}$ -submodule of $\text{res } S_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\lambda$.
- b) There is a $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta, n-1}$ -isomorphism $\pi : U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu \rightarrow S_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$ given by $f_n \mapsto e_\mu$.
- c) The restricted Specht module $\text{res } S_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\lambda$ (resp. $\text{res } S_k^\lambda$) has a submodule isomorphic to $S_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$ (resp. S_k^μ), namely $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$ (resp. U_k^μ).

Proof. To show a) we use the assumptions on r_i together with Theorem 1 to deduce that $f_n \in S_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\lambda$. But f_n generates $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$ and the statement a) follows.

To show b) we first observe that $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$ is a free $\mathcal{A}_\zeta$ -module since it is a submodule of the free $\mathcal{A}_\zeta$ -module $\text{res } S_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\lambda$ and $\mathcal{A}_\zeta$ is a principal ideal domain. Since $U^\mu = U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu \otimes_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta} \mathcal{K} = S^\mu$ we get that the rank of $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$ is equal to $\dim S_{\mathcal{K}}^\mu$.

For t a standard μ -tableau we use the standard notation $d(t)$ for the element of S_{n-1} that satisfies $t^\mu d(t) = t$. We use it to define the following subset of $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$:

$$B := \{ f_n T_{d(t)} \mid t \text{ standard } \mu\text{-tableau} \}$$

By applying Young's seminormal form (5) to each term of $T_{i_1} T_{i_2} \dots T_{i_K}$ where $s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \dots s_{i_K}$ is a reduced expression of $d(t)$, we find that $f_n T_{d(t)} = f_{t_n d(t)}$ modulo a $\mathcal{K}$ -linear combination of f_s with $s > t_n d(t)$. This uses the compatibility of the Bruhat order with the dominance order, see Lemma 3.8 ii) of [M4]. Comparing with the above rank calculation, we now deduce that B is a $\mathcal{K}$ -basis of $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$ and hence also an $\mathcal{A}_\zeta$ -basis of $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$.

We now show that $f_n \mapsto e_\mu$ extends to an $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta, n-1}$ -homomorphism. This is not obvious, since f_n and e_μ may have different annihilators in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta, n-1}$. But once we know that $f_n \mapsto e_\mu$ does extend to an $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta, n-1}$ -homomorphism, it will necessarily be an isomorphism since $S_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$ is generated by e_μ and both sides are free of the same rank.

To show that $f_n \mapsto e_\mu$ indeed induces a homomorphism we give combinatorial descriptions of the action of T_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-2$, in $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$ and in $S_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$. Let first t be a standard μ -tableau and consider $e_\mu T_{d(t)}$. It is by definition equal to e_t , but since $e_\mu = f_\mu$ it can also be calculated in terms of $\{f_t \mid t \text{ standard}\}$ if we use Young's seminormal representation (5) repeatedly on a reduced decomposition $T_{d(t)} = T_{i_1} T_{i_2} \dots T_{i_K}$. In other words, we have that

$$e_\mu T_{d(t)} = \sum_u c_{t,u} f_u$$

for certain $c_{t,u} \in \mathcal{K}$, depending through (5) on t and the standard μ -tableau u . We gather the coefficients in the matrix $C := (c_{t,u})$ indexed by pairs of standard tableaux.

Let now $\tilde{T}_i$ be the matrix of the action of T_i on $S_{\mathcal{K}}^{\mu}$ with respect to the f_t -basis. Then the matrix of T_i with respect to the standard basis e_t is given by $C^{-1} T_i C$. This matrix of course has entries in $\mathcal{A}$ although neither C nor $\tilde{T}_i$ does.

We now replace e_{μ} by f_n and consider $f_n T_{d(t)}$ where t is as above, i.e. an element of the basis B of $U_{\mathcal{A}_{\zeta}}^{\mu}$. We get as before that

$$f_n T_{d(t)} = \sum_v d_{t,v} f_v \quad (16)$$

where v now takes values in standard λ -tableaux and $d_{t,v} \in \mathcal{K}$. Since $d(t) \in S_{n-1}$ all appearing v will have n in the same position (k, l) . Let v^- be the μ -tableau obtained by deleting this node from v . Then a key observation is that $d_{t,v} = c_{t,v^-}$. It holds because the calculation of $d_{t,v}$ and $c_{t,u}$ via (5) only depends on the radial lengths between nodes of content $\{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$. Thus, if we define the matrix $D := (d_{t,v})$, then C is the submatrix obtained by deleting those indices v that correspond to tableaux such that $v[k, l] \neq n$.

We now consider the action of T_i in

$$\text{span}\{f_v \mid v^- \text{ is a standard } \mu\text{-tableau and } v[k, l] = n\}$$

The generators f_v form a basis and we let $\tilde{S}_i$ be the matrix of T_i with respect to it. Then by (5) once again, under $v \mapsto v^-$ the matrix $\tilde{S}_i$ becomes equal to $\tilde{T}_i$. Combining, we get that the matrices of T_i in $U_{\mathcal{A}_{\zeta}}^{\mu}$ with respect to the B basis and in $S_{\mathcal{A}_{\zeta}}^{\mu}$ with respect to the standard basis are equal. This proves b).

To show c) note that π maps basis elements of $U_{\mathcal{A}_{\zeta}}^{\mu}$ to certain standard basis elements of $\text{res } S_{\mathcal{A}_{\zeta}}^{\mu}$. Thus also $\text{res } S_{\mathcal{A}_{\zeta}}^{\mu} / U_{\mathcal{A}_{\zeta}}^{\mu}$ is free over $\mathcal{A}_{\zeta}$ and c) follows by reduction mod I . $\square$

Note that the above proof works in part without the exact knowledge of the denominators of f_n . We need to generalize these aspects to be able to treat the general base change coefficients between f_t and e_t .

We first fix some notation related to partitions and tableaux. Let λ be a partition of n and let t be a λ -tableau. Recall the notation $[t] = \lambda$ for the shape function and recall that $t_{[1, 2, \dots, m]}$ is the tableau obtained from t by deleting the nodes with contents in $\{m+1, m+2, \dots, n\}$. We set $\lambda_t^{\leq i} = \lambda^{\leq i} = \lambda^{< i+1} = [t_{[1, 2, \dots, m]}]$ and may this way identify t with its associated chain of partitions

$$\lambda^{\leq 1} \subset \lambda^{\leq 2} \subset \dots \subset \lambda^{\leq n}$$

Let $t^{\leq} = t_{[r, \dots, s]}^{\leq}$ denote the $\lambda^{\leq s}$ -tableau that coincides with t in the nodes of contents $r, r+1, \dots, s$ and has $1, 2, \dots, r-1$ filled in along rows in the

remaining positions. We introduce an $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta, r-1}$ -submodule of S^λ by setting $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^{t \leq} := f_{t \leq} \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta, r-1}$. The case $r = s = n$ of this module is our previous $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^\mu$. With this notation at hand, we can now formulate the following Theorem.

Theorem 3. *The rule*

$$\varphi : U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^{t \leq} \rightarrow S_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^{\lambda^{< r}}, \quad f_{t \leq} \mapsto e_{\lambda^{< r}}$$

defines an isomorphism of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta, r-1}$ -modules.

Proof. The proof follows closely the proof of b) of the last Theorem. We indicate briefly the necessary modifications. Set

$$B_1 := \{f_{t \leq} T_{d(u)} \mid u \text{ standard } \lambda^{< r} \text{-tableau}\}$$

Then as in the proof of the previous theorem we see that B_1 is a k -linearly independent set of S^λ and then also an $\mathcal{A}_\zeta$ -linearly independent subset of S^λ . Thus $N^{\lambda^{< r}} := \text{span}_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta} B_1$ is a free $\mathcal{A}_\zeta$ -module of the same rank as $S_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^{\lambda^{< r}}$. By Young's seminormal representation (5) the elements of B_1 can be expressed in terms of

$$B_2 = \{f_{t \leq} T_{d(u)} \mid u \text{ standard } \lambda^{< r} \text{-tableau}\}$$

Let D be the base change matrix between B_1 and B_2 . If $\tilde{T}_i$ is the matrix of the action of T_i with respect to B_2 , then $D^{-1} \tilde{T}_i D$ is the matrix of T_i respect to B_1 . Since the same method can be used to obtain the matrix of T_i with respect to the standard basis of $S_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^{\lambda^{< r}}$, we get that $N^{\lambda^{< r}} \cong S_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^{\lambda^{< r}}$. This implies that $N^{\lambda^{< r}}$ is a $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta, r-1}$ -submodule of $U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^{t \leq}$ containing the generator and we conclude that $N^{\lambda^{< r}} = U_{\mathcal{A}_\zeta}^{t \leq}$. The theorem is proved. $\square$

We now return to the problem of determining the coefficients of the expansion of f_t in terms of e_t . This time we consider a general λ -tableau t . Let us define P_t of $\mathcal{H}_n$ by

$$P_t := P_n P_{n-1} P_{n-2} \dots P_2 P_1$$

where $P_i := P_{t_{\lfloor i}^{\leq}} \in \mathcal{H}_i$ is the element introduced in Remark 2, with respect to the $\lambda^{\leq i}$ -tableau $t_{\lfloor i}^{\leq}$ with i in the same node as in t and the remaining numbers $1, 2, \dots, n-1$ filled in by rows. We can then state the following generalization of Theorem 1. We consider it our main Theorem.

Theorem 4. *In the above setup we have $f_t = e_\lambda P_t$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1 we know that $f_{t_n} = f_{t_n^{\leq}} = e_\lambda P_n$. Likewise we have $f_{t_{\lfloor n-1}^{\leq}} = e_{\lambda^{\leq(n-1)}} P_{n-1}$. On the other hand, if we define $a := (t_{\lfloor n}^{\leq})[k, l]$ where (k, l) is given by $(t_{\lfloor n-1, n}^{\leq})[k, l] = n-1$, then $t_{\lfloor n}^{\leq} \sigma_{a, n-1} = t_{\lfloor n-1, n}^{\leq}$. We then write $T_{a, n-1} = T_{i_1} T_{i_2} \dots T_{i_L}$ in reduced form and apply Young's

seminormal (5) on each term to calculate $f_{t_{|n}^{\leq}} T_{a,n-1}$. We end up with an expression of the form

$$f_{t_{|n-1,n}^{\leq}} = \sum_{w \in S_{n-1}} \mu_w f_{t_{|n}^{\leq}} T_w$$

On the other hand, $\sigma_{a,n-1}$ also satisfies $t^{\lambda \leq (n-1)} \sigma_{a,n-1} = t_{|n-1}^{\leq}$ and so we get similarly that

$$f_{t_{|n-1}^{\leq}} = \sum_{w \in S_{n-1}} \mu_w e_{\lambda \leq (n-1)} T_w$$

The coefficients μ_w of the two equations are the same since only radial lengths between nodes of contents $\{a, a+1, \dots, n-1\}$ are involved. Combining the equations with $f_{t_{|n-1}^{\leq}} = P_{n-1} e_{\lambda \leq (n-1)}$ and using Theorem 3 we get

$$f_{t_{|n-1,n}^{\leq}} = f_{t_{|n}^{\leq}} P_{n-1}$$

and hence $f_{t_{|n-1,n}^{\leq}} = e_{\lambda} P_n P_{n-1}$.

This argument is now repeated until arriving at

$$f_t = f_{t_{|1,2,\dots,n}^{\leq}} = e_{\lambda} P_n P_{n-1} P_3 \dots P_1$$

which is the formula claimed in the Theorem. $\square$

Let us illustrate the theorem on the partition $\lambda = (3, 1^2)$ of 5 and the tableau $t = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline 2 & & \\ \hline 3 & & \\ \hline \end{array}$. We have by the Theorem that $f_t = e_{\lambda} P_5 P_4 P_3 P_2 P_1$.

But since $t_{|1,2,3}$ is the highest (in fact the only) standard $\lambda^{\leq 3}$ -tableau we get that $P_3 = P_2 = P_1 = 1$. By Theorem 2 we have for $f_{t_{|5}^{\leq}}$ the following expansion in standard e_t

$$f_{t_{|5}^{\leq}} = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3 & & \\ \hline 4 & & \\ \hline \end{array} + \frac{1}{[4]_q} \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array} - q \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \right)$$

In other words $P_5 = T_{3,5} + \frac{1}{[4]_q}(-q + T_3)$. We then focus on 4. Using Theorem 2 once more we have for $f_{t_{|4}^{\leq}}$ the following expansion

$$f_{t_{|4}^{\leq}} = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & \\ \hline 3 & \\ \hline \end{array} + \frac{1}{[3]_q} \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & \\ \hline 4 & \\ \hline \end{array} - q \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & \\ \hline 4 & \\ \hline \end{array} \right)$$

We get $P_4 = T_{2,4} + \frac{1}{[3]_q}(-q + T_2)$. Applying this on the expression for $f_{t_{|4}^{\leq}}$ we get a combination of 9 standard e_t . Some of these will not be standard

and after straightening they reduce to

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline 2 & & \\ \hline 3 & & \\ \hline \end{array} + \frac{1}{[3]_q} \left(\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array} - q \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & & \\ \hline 5 & & \\ \hline \end{array} - q \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 3 & & \\ \hline 4 & & \\ \hline \end{array} - \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 5 \\ \hline 2 & & \\ \hline 4 & & \\ \hline \end{array} \right)$$

For comparison, repeated use of Young's seminormal form twice on the expression for $f_{t \leq \frac{1}{5}}$ would have given $4 \cdot 3 = 12$ e_t 's instead of 9 (that after straightening would have reduced to the above expression, of course). In general, as actually already follows from Theorem 1, there will be more than one denominator, i.e. the above example with only denominator $[3]_q$ is special.

Let us do a simple complexity analysis of the two algorithm's for calculating f_t . Suppose $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2^{k_2})$ is a fat hook partition with first row of width one. Then $n = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 k_2$ and $a = \lambda_1$, hence $\sigma_{a,n}$ has length $\lambda_2 k_2$. Thus, repeated use of Young's seminormal form to calculate f_n produces a linear combination $2^{\lambda_2 k_2}$ (standard and non-standard) e_t 's. Using Lemma 2 instead, for example in the formulation given in Corollary 1, gives rise to

$$(\lambda_2 - 1)^{k_2} + \dots + (\lambda_2 - 1)^2 + (\lambda_2 - 1) = \frac{(\lambda_2 - 1)^{k_2+1} - \lambda_2 - 1}{\lambda_2 - 2}$$

e_t -terms. Thus, with respect to λ_2 we see that Lemma 2 has polynomial complexity whereas repeated use of Young's seminormal form has exponential complexity. This relationship carries over to the general algorithm of Theorem 4.

As we already saw in the above example the general method of Theorem 4 will unfortunately in general produce an expansion of f_t in terms of *all* standard tableaux, not just the standard ones, and therefore it does not provide exact information on which denominators occur. Still, by the above, it gives a better approximation than repeated use of Young's seminormal form. We have implemented the algorithm using the GAP system. For $n \leq 10$ the program needs less than one minute on a notebook to work out f_t . Within the same time span, the program goes up to $n = 12$ if $q = 1$. The program also checks orthogonality between f_t and e_s for $s > t$.

REFERENCES

- [A] S. Ariki, On the decomposition numbers of the Hecke algebra $G(m, 1, n)$. J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **36** (1996), 789-808.
- [C] I. Cherednik, Double affine Hecke algebras and Macdonald's conjectures, Annals of Maths., **141**, (1995), 191-216.
- [DJ] R. Dipper, G. James, Blocks and idempotents of Hecke algebras of general linear groups. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **54** (1987), no. 1, 57-82.

- [H] M. Haiman, Hilbert schemes, polygraphs and the Macdonald positivity conjecture, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (2001), no. 4, 941-1006.
- [J] G. D. James, The representation theory of the symmetric groups **682**, Lecture notes in mathematics, Springer Verlag (1978).
- [JM] G. D. James, G. E. Murphy, The Determinant of the Gram Matrix for a Specht Module, Journal of Algebra **59** (1979).
- [LLT] A. Lascoux, B. Leclerc, J.-Y. Thibon, Hecke algebras at roots of unity and crystal bases of quantum affine algebras, Commun. Math. Phys. **181** (1996), 205-263.
- [M1] G. E. Murphy, On the Representation Theory of the Symmetric Groups and Associated Hecke Algebras, Journal of Algebra, **152** (1992), 492-513.
- [M2] G. E. Murphy, The Idempotents of the Symmetric Groups and Nakayama's Conjecture, Journal of Algebra, **81** (1983), 258-265.
- [M3] G. E. Murphy, A New Construction of Young's Seminormal Representation of the Symmetric Groups, Journal of Algebra **69** (1981), 287-297.
- [M4] G. E. Murphy, The Representations of Hecke Algebras of type A_n , Journal of Algebra **173**, 97-121 (1995).
- [Ma] A. Mathas, Iwahori-Hecke Algebras and Schur Algebras of the Symmetric Group. Univ. Lecture Series 15, Amer. Math. Soc., 1999.
- [R] A. Ram, Skew representations are irreducible, in Combinatorial and Geometric representation theory, S.-J. Kang and K.-H. Lee eds., Contemp. Math. **325** Amer. Math. Soc. 2003, 161-189.
- [RH] S. Ryom-Hansen, Grading the translation functors in type A, J. Algebra **274** (2004), no. 1, 138-163.
- [S⁺97] Martin Schönert et al. GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming – version 3 release 4 patchlevel 4". Lehrstuhl D für Mathematik, Rheinisch Westfälische Technische Hochschule, Aachen, Germany, 1997.

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA Y FÍSICA, UNIVERSIDAD DE TALCA, CHILE, STEEN@INST-MAT.UTALCA.CL